

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**THE SEARCH FOR A
ROUTINE OUTCOME MEASURE FOR
MULTIDISCIPLINARY INTERVENTIONS
WITH YOUNG PEOPLE
IN NEW ZEALAND**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Clinical Psychology
at Massey University, Manawatu campus, New Zealand.

Amber Barry

2011

ABSTRACT

Routine outcome measurement in mental health services is becoming standard practice around the world and has benefits for the public, researchers, funders, managers, and most importantly clinicians and clients. New Zealand's child and adolescent mental health services mandated the use of the *Health of the Nation Outcome Scale for Children and Adolescents* in 2005. Unfortunately, this decision was not based on a systematic or comprehensive review of available measures, as had been the case overseas. This research aimed to identify and recommend a measure that was psychometrically robust, feasible, and useful to multidisciplinary practitioners in New Zealand. The six studies conducted also contributed to the scarce literature on practitioner's opinions about routine measurement and the suitability of an overseas measure for a New Zealand population. A postal survey and focus groups with practitioners indicated mixed support for outcome measurement, with few measures identified or recommended by participants. Although many barriers were endorsed, the reasons to use measures were generally rated as more important. An extensive search of the international literature provided an up-to-date review of outcome measures for young people. From the initial 1665, six short-listed measures were reviewed by experts and practitioners before the *Ohio Youth Problems, Functioning, and Satisfaction Scales* was recommended as most suited for multidisciplinary interventions. Two further studies provided preliminary data about the Ohio Scales' (developed in the USA) suitability for use in New Zealand. Consultation with clinicians, parents, and young people indicated minor wording changes would improve its appropriateness for New Zealand. Then, a New Zealand field-test indicated the psychometric properties of the measure were preserved, but significantly different scale scores were found in comparison to a community sample from Ohio, USA, although this could have been a product of the small sample size. The Ohio Scales offers clinicians the necessary balance between breadth of content, brevity, and psychometric strength for its use to benefit their practice and the organisations they work in.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis has involved many people and I am grateful for their assistance, support, and guidance. Bringing together the variety of studies that make up this research could not have happened without the input of university staff, research and clinical colleagues, family, friends, and, most importantly, the organisations and individuals who took part. I would like to acknowledge their input here.

Thank you to my thesis supervisors, Prof. Ian Evans, Dr Shane Harvey, and Ms Cheryl Woolley, and the university staff who assisted me through this process. I am grateful for the financial support that made this research possible. This included funding from the High and Complex Needs Unit, the School of Psychology (Graduate Assistantship and doctoral research funding), the Doctoral Research Committee (Massey Doctoral Scholarship), and the Vic Davis Memorial Trust (Post-graduate Mental Health Practitioner Training Scholarship). Research and clinical colleagues have provided valuable suggestions, mentoring, and support over the last few years. Thank you particularly to John Fitzgerald, Simon Bennett, Don Baken, Ella Kahu, Jan Dickson, and Sarah Malthus. I would also like to thank Ben Ogles (developer of the Ohio Scales) for his generosity in allowing me to adapt his outcome measure for this research.

My appreciation for the unwavering encouragement, patience, and faith of my family and friends is huge. There are too many people to name specifically, but my special thanks go to Felicity, Josh, Mishka, Jake, Trudy, Sylvia, Sarah, Jo, Claire, Renee, Mel,

Di, John, Liesje, Laura, Rif, Melanie, Liz, Ana and Annette. I would like to especially acknowledge those who shared with me the internship, thesis retreat, and TAG meetings; you've been wonderful.

Finally, I am so grateful for the help of everyone around New Zealand who took part in this research. The High and Complex Needs Unit and the practitioners who participated in the survey or focus groups were so generous with their time. Thanks also to the school principals and teachers who kindly distributed the Ohio Scales. To the anonymous students and parents who completed those forms, thank you for your willingness to advance applied psychological research by sharing your personal information. Similarly, the carefully considered feedback on the Ohio Scales that was supplied by clinicians, parents, and young people was very much appreciated. I am so pleased and thankful that you helped fill the pages that follow with your contributions.

Thank you very much to everyone mentioned here, and to those who are not, but who were part of the process in small, but important ways.



AUTHOR'S NOTE

This thesis presents six studies on the topic of outcome measurement with young people in New Zealand. The first four studies were funded by a research contract with the High and Complex Needs Unit (HCN). *The HCN Outcome Measurement Project* was undertaken by a team of five clinical psychology researchers, of which I was a part. These studies were presented in a final report to HCN (Harvey, Barry, Fitzgerald, Evans, & Bennett, 2007), which is now publically available on their website. I would like to acknowledge the work of the team and make clear my contribution to the project and its connection to this thesis. It should be noted that from the outset of the project, it was agreed by the Principal Investigators (Prof. Evans and Dr Harvey) that the work I contributed would be considered suitable for submission as my doctoral thesis.

I was involved in all aspects of the project from writing the initial proposal to the oral presentation of the findings to HCN staff. While individual team members worked on specific studies, I was involved in all four, to varying degrees, as follows:

- *Practitioner Survey* – involved in the design of the survey and analysis of the data
- *HCN Advisor Focus Groups* – involved in the development of the questions and recruitment of participants, was one of three facilitators, conducted independent analysis of the transcripts
- *HCN Practitioner Focus Groups* – involved in the development of the questions and recruitment of participants, was one of two facilitators, conducted independent analysis of the transcripts
- *Measure Review* – (led this study) completed the search in its entirety, was one of two researchers screening the results, one of four reviewers of the final measures

In addition, the written work presented in the HCN report is not replicated exactly in this thesis. The chapters here were written by me using the data and analysis from the original project (in addition, the introductory chapters, the two additional Ohio studies, and the concluding chapter are my own work, independent of the HCN project/report). Parts of *Chapter 8* are drawn from a second contracted report completed for HCN (Barry, Baken, Fitzgerald, Evans, & Harvey, 2007), which is not publically available. Those parts were written by me originally, and small, relevant portions have been adapted for use in this thesis. The two reports referred to in this note are:

- Harvey, S., Barry, A., Fitzgerald, J., Evans, I., & Bennett, S. (2007). *Best practice outcome assessment for children and youth with high and complex needs*. Unpublished report for the High and Complex Needs Intersectoral Unit. Massey Psychology Clinic/The Psychology Centre. Palmerston North/Hamilton, NZ.
- Barry, A., Baken, D., Fitzgerald, J., Evans, I., & Harvey, S. (2007). *Preparing a formal outcome monitoring protocol for use with High and Complex Needs cases*. Unpublished report for the High and Complex Needs Intersectoral Unit. Massey University/The Psychology Centre. Palmerston North/Hamilton, NZ.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	I
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	II
AUTHOR’S NOTE	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VI
LIST OF TABLES	XIII
LIST OF FIGURES.....	XIV
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	XVI
CHAPTER 1 – OUTCOMES AND THEIR MEASUREMENT	1
<i>The rise of outcomes</i>	2
Early mental health services: Therapy is un-measurable.....	2
A shift: Symptoms and therapy are measurable.....	2
Economics and the provision of effective treatments	3
From effective services to effective people	4
<i>Outcome measurement</i>	5
Definitions	5

Outcome measures	6
The benefits of measuring outcomes	8
Research, policy, and funding.....	8
Organisation, agency, or service.....	10
Clinicians, young people, and their families	11
CHAPTER 2 – ROUTINE OUTCOME MEASUREMENT	15
<i>Routine outcome measurement</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Requirements of a good outcome measure</i>	<i>16</i>
Psychometric profile	17
Usefulness.....	17
Feasibility.....	19
<i>Current practices</i>	<i>21</i>
International experience.....	21
United Kingdom	21
Australia.....	22
United States of America	25
New Zealand’s experience	27
MH-SMART and CAOS.....	27
Merry and colleagues’ report	29
Implementation of routine outcome measurement in New Zealand	31
<i>Introduction to the present research</i>	<i>32</i>
CHAPTER 3 – OUTCOME MEASUREMENT IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY SETTINGS	35
<i>Outcome measures for young people and multidisciplinary teams.....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>The High and Complex Needs Strategy</i>	<i>36</i>
The High & Complex Needs Unit	37
HCN’s request for tenders	38
The HCN Outcome Measurement Project.....	40
<i>Introduction to the HCN studies</i>	<i>40</i>
CHAPTER 4 – STUDY ONE: CURRENT HCN MEASUREMENT PRACTICE.....	42
<i>Method.....</i>	<i>44</i>
Participants.....	44
Materials	45
Procedure.....	46
<i>Results</i>	<i>46</i>

Characteristics of participants and their clients.....	46
Participant characteristics	46
Client characteristics	47
Participants' current outcome measurement practice	49
Experience using outcome measures for HCN	49
Indicators to practitioners of client progress.....	51
Indicators to practitioners of client readiness to transition	52
Reasons for using outcome measures	53
Barriers to using outcome measures	54
Perceived usefulness of outcome measures	56
Ideal outcome measurement practice	57
Preparation required.....	57
Domains where measurement would be useful.....	59
Ideal approach	59
Recommended outcome measures.....	61
Additional issues.....	63
Cautions and reservations.....	63
Advice about measure selection	64
Advice about implementation.....	65
Summary	65
Characteristics of participants and their clients.....	65
Participants' current practice	66
Participants' ideal approach	68
Participants' recommendations for measures.....	68
Additional issues.....	69
Conclusions.....	70
CHAPTER 5 – STUDY TWO: CURRENT HCN MEASUREMENT PRACTICE	72
<i>Perspectives of HCN Advisors</i>	73
Method.....	73
Participants.....	73
Discussion questions	73
Procedure.....	74
Results	74
a. Current outcome measurement is problematic.....	75
b. Barriers to outcome measurement.....	76
c. Perceptions of the HCN teams' views	78
d. Ideal outcome measurement	78
Summary.....	80

<i>Perspectives of HCN practitioners</i>	82
Method.....	82
Participants.....	82
Discussion questions.....	83
Procedure.....	83
Results	83
a. Spotting change.....	84
b. Methods and tools.....	87
c. Accountability.....	89
d. Monitoring and management.....	90
e. Feedback from the client/family.....	91
Summary.....	91
<i>Conclusions</i>	92
CHAPTER 6 – STUDY THREE: THE SEARCH FOR SUITABLE MEASURES	95
<i>Parameters of the search</i>	95
The nature of the work of HCN	95
Domains of outcome.....	96
Criteria for the ideal measure.....	98
<i>The search for measures</i>	99
Identifying potential measures.....	99
Search of electronic sources.....	100
Search of catalogues	101
Search of published reviews.....	101
Screening the search results	102
The first screen	102
The second screen	103
The third screen.....	103
<i>Brief review of measures</i>	104
Measures of culture	105
1. Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure.....	105
Measures of education.....	106
2. Canadian Achievement Tests – Third edition	106
Measures of family.....	107
3. Family Environment Scale.....	107
4. Index of Family Relations	108
5. McMaster Family Assessment Device – Version 3.....	109
6. North Carolina Family Assessment Scale – Version 2.0.....	110

7. Self-report Family Inventory	111
Measures of mental health	112
8. Hua Oranga	112
9. Pediatric Symptom Checklist.....	113
10. Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire	114
Measures of physical health.....	115
11. Child Health and Illness Profile	115
Measures with several areas of focus.....	116
12. Behaviour Evaluation Scale – 3 rd edition	116
13. Child Health Questionnaire	117
14. Clinical Assessment Package for Risks and Strengths.....	118
15. Health of the Nation Outcome Scales for Children and Adolescents	119
16. Ohio Youth Problems, Functioning & Satisfaction Scales.....	120
17. Youth Outcome Questionnaire.....	121
Summary	122
CHAPTER 7 – STUDY FOUR: CONSULTATION AND SELECTION OF AN OUTCOME	
MEASURE.....	125
<i>Expert consultation</i>	<i>126</i>
Expert discussion of the short-listed measures.....	126
Expert recommendations	128
<i>Practitioner consultation</i>	<i>129</i>
Focus groups: Part II	129
Practitioner discussion of the short-listed measures	129
North Carolina Family Assessment Scale	130
The Ohio Youth Problems, Functioning, and Satisfaction Scales	131
Pediatric Symptom Checklist.....	133
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire.....	134
Youth Outcome Questionnaire	135
Practitioner recommendations	137
<i>Summary of expert & practitioner consultation</i>	<i>138</i>
<i>Selection of an appropriate outcome measure</i>	<i>139</i>
Issues to consider for implementing routine measurement	140
Final selection and recommendation	141
CHAPTER 8 – ADAPTING OVERSEAS MEASURES FOR LOCAL USE.....	142
<i>The Ohio Youth Problems, Functioning, & Satisfaction Scales</i>	<i>142</i>
Development and current use.....	142

Content and structure.....	143
Psychometric properties.....	145
<i>Preparation of measures for use in New Zealand.....</i>	146
Assessment of suitability.....	146
Preliminary local data.....	147
<i>Introduction to the Ohio Scales' studies.....</i>	147
CHAPTER 9 – STUDY FIVE: PRELIMINARY LOCAL DATA FOR THE OHIO SCALES.....	149
<i>Method.....</i>	150
Participants.....	150
Materials.....	151
Procedure.....	151
<i>Results.....</i>	152
Missing data.....	152
Scale performance.....	152
Reliability.....	152
Validity.....	153
Comparative analysis.....	153
Demographic information.....	153
Problem Severity and Functioning.....	154
<i>Summary.....</i>	157
CHAPTER 10 – STUDY SIX: INFORMANT FEEDBACK ON THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE OHIO SCALES FOR NEW ZEALAND.....	160
<i>Method.....</i>	161
Participants.....	161
Workers.....	162
Parents/caregivers.....	162
Youth.....	162
Materials.....	162
Procedure.....	163
<i>Results.....</i>	163
Client details section.....	164
Problem Severity scale items.....	164
“ROLES” section.....	164
Hopefulness and Satisfaction scale items.....	165
Functioning scale items.....	165

Bicultural appropriateness	166
General feedback	166
<i>Summary</i>	167
CHAPTER 11 – SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	170
<i>Summary of research findings</i>	170
Aim 1	170
Aim 2.....	172
Aim 3.....	173
<i>Discussion</i>	174
REFERENCES	180
APPENDIX A – STUDY ONE: HCN PRACTITIONER SURVEY	198
APPENDIX B – STUDY TWO: HCN FOCUS GROUPS	208
APPENDIX C – STUDY FOUR: EXPERT AND PRACTITIONER CONSULTATION	214
APPENDIX D – STUDY FIVE: COLLECTION OF NZ DATA FOR THE OHIO SCALES	238
APPENDIX E – STUDY SIX: INFORMANT FEEDBACK ON THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE OHIO SCALES FOR NZ	246

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	<i>Proportions of Participants* Stating Each Reason to Use/Not Use (a) Any of the Measures Identified, (b) HoNOS-CA, and (c) SDQ</i>	30
Table 2	<i>Professional Discipline of Survey Participants</i>	47
Table 3	<i>Characteristics of Participants' HCN Clients</i>	48
Table 4	<i>Proportion of Participants Indicating Outcome Measures Would be Useful in Each Domain of Functioning.....</i>	59
Table 5	<i>Participants' Comments about Outcome Measures They Recommended.</i>	61
Table 6	<i>HCN's Seven Domains of Well-being and Associated Key Areas of Outcome.....</i>	97
Table 7	<i>Keywords Used to Search Electronic Databases.....</i>	100
Table 8	<i>Search Results: Measures Remaining After the Screening Process</i>	104
Table 9	<i>Comparison of the 17 Reviewed Measures Against the Requirements of a "Good Routine Outcome Measure"</i>	124
Table 10	<i>Reliability Estimates Reported for the Ohio Scales' Parallel Informant Forms</i>	145
Table 11	<i>Internal Consistency Estimates for the Ohio Scales with a NZ Sample...</i>	153
Table 12	<i>Correlation Between Problem Severity and Functioning Scale Scores....</i>	153
Table 13	<i>Comparison of Gender and Age for the Ohio and NZ Samples.....</i>	154
Table 14	<i>Comparison of Mean Scale Scores for the Ohio and NZ Samples.....</i>	155

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1.* Illustration of the increase in outcome literature by comparing the number of citations in a PsychInfo search, indexed on 1986..... 4
- Figure 2.* Proportion of participants rating the significance of each presenting issue for the HCN clients they have worked with. Rated on a scale from 1 (not significant at all) to 5 (very significant issue), and ranked top to bottom by mean rating..... 49
- Figure 3.* Proportion of participants rating the importance of each source of information for determining the progress of HCN clients they have worked with. Rated on a scale from 1 (not important at all) to 5 (very important indicator), and ranked top to bottom by mean rating. 51
- Figure 4.* Proportion of participants rating the importance of each source of information for determining whether HCN clients they have worked with are ready to transition back to mainstream services. Rated on a scale from 1 (not important at all) to 5 (very important indicator), and ranked top to bottom by mean rating. 53
- Figure 5.* Proportion of participants rating the importance of each reason why practitioners should use outcome measures. Rated on a scale from 1 (not important at all) to 5 (very important reason), and ranked top to bottom by mean rating..... 54
- Figure 6.* Proportion of participants rating the importance of each barrier to practitioners using outcome measures. Rated on a scale from 1 (not

important at all) to 5 (very important reason), and ranked top to bottom by mean rating..... 55

Figure 7. 95% confidence intervals for mean Problem Severity scale score for the three informant groups in the New Zealand and Ohio samples..... 156

Figure 8. 95% confidence intervals for mean Functioning scale score for the three informant groups in the New Zealand and Ohio samples..... 157

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABAS	Adaptive Behavior Assessment Scale
ACC	Accident & Compensation Corporation
BDI	Beck Depression Inventory
BES3	Behavior Evaluation Scale – 3 rd edition
BYIs	Beck Youth Inventories
CAMHS	Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services
CAOS	Classification & Outcomes Study
CASPARS	Clinical Assessment Package for Risks and Strengths
CAT3	Canadian Achievement Tests – 3 rd edition
CBCL	Child Behavior Checklist
CDI	Child Depression Inventory
CHIP	Child Health & Illness Profile
CHQ	Child Health Questionnaire
Conners'	Conners' Rating Scale-Revised
CORS	Child Outcome Rating Scale
CYF	Child, Youth & Family
DHB	District Health Board
DSM-IV	Diagnostic & Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders – 4 th edition
FACES	Family Adaptability & Cohesion Evaluation Scales
FAD	Family Assessment Device
FES	Family Environment Scale
GAF	Global Assessment of Functioning

HCN	High & Complex Needs Unit
HCN Strategy	Intersectoral Strategy for Children & Young People with High & Complex Needs
HoNOS	Health of the Nation Outcome Scales
HoNOS-CA	Health of the Nation Outcome Scales for Children & Adolescents
IFR	Index of Family Relations
IQ	Intelligence Quotient
KORS	Kaupapa Outcome Rating Scale
LSC	Local Service Coordinator
MEIM	Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure
MH-SMART	Mental Health Standard Measures of Assessment & Recovery Initiative
MMYBO	Mental Measurements Yearbook Online
NCFAS	North Carolina Family Assessment Scale
NZ	New Zealand
Ohio Scales	The Ohio Youth Problems, Functioning, & Satisfaction Scales
ORS	Outcome Rating Scale
PSC	Pediatric Symptom Checklist
ROLES	Restrictiveness of Living Environments Scale
RTLB	Resource Teacher of Learning & Behaviour
SDQ	Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire
SFI	Self-report Family Inventory
SRS	Session Rating Scale
SSA	Social Services Abstracts
TRF	Teacher Report Form
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United States of America
WISC	Wechsler Intelligence Scales for Children
YOQ	Youth Outcome Questionnaire
YSR	Youth Self Report